

Secretary Rusk's News Conference of February 1

Transcript of the News Conference

Secretary of State Dean Rusk said that he had been surprised to find that "in the middle of the week" he received from friends in Canada on account of the press conference he had given in London. There is a strong feeling of fairness in the Canadian press, and he said that he was very glad to hear that. He said that he was very glad to hear that the Canadian press was so fair and so objective. He said that he was very glad to hear that the Canadian press was so fair and so objective. He said that he was very glad to hear that the Canadian press was so fair and so objective.

It became necessary, as the result of statements made in the course of debate in the House last week. Without reference to us, and without demand for this or that, a charge of a kind of admission of an error in our policy of peaceful exchanges between our two Governments, made in the House of Representatives, was forwarded by members of the House which appeared to offer new interpretations of the policies of the United States.

As a result, a number of questions were raised with our Government by Canadian and American reporters, by Members of our Congress, and by ordinary citizens. It became clear that we should have to give some account of our own views. This question, after all, is one which involves the legitimate concerns of both our peoples. Our common effort for the defense of North America and our partnership in NATO necessarily involve us all. Yet we were well aware of the fact that these issues are politically very sensitive in Canada, and we did not wish to engage in discussion at a level which would seem to imply criticism of any individual or group from any leading officer of our Government. Nor did we believe that a diplomatic protest was appropriate. Such a protest, indeed, might have been called interference

in the right of the other side to state its own position and its own views on our policies.

So we determined to give a statement of the facts as we understand them. I have already expressed the opinion that our view was right, but I believe the facts of the matter as we understand them were fairly set out, and certainly if the statement contained any errors, we shall be prompt to correct them.

It should be clear to all North Americans that of course, if final decisions about our policy are not in our common defense, are for the United States, and are in the United States Government, we will that decisions about our policy will be made particularly strong and careful. We will always respect the right of each of our people and of our political system to express its own views, and we shall continue to do so. But in the long run the final decisions about our people, which involve the security of our people, but requires open and honest discussion of our great common problems.

Soviet Suspension of Test Ban Talks

I should also like to comment informally on the suspension of the nuclear test discussions pending the return to the Geneva Conference in about 15 days' time.

It is always difficult to understand what is in the mind of the other side in a discussion of this sort, and I am sure that there will be considerable speculation as to why the Soviet Union suspended the present discussions. I am inclined to believe that if there is a single and sufficient answer, we should concentrate on that, even though there could be other factors in the situation.

The basic position of the Soviet Union seems

¹ For a statement of Jan. 31 by William C. Foster, Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, see p. 236.

² See p. 243.

2. *Reduction in negotiations:*
 1. *2000-2001: 10% drop in 2000*

These findings have important implications for the design of the WTP estimation exercise. First, the results suggest that the willingness to pay for a unit of improvement in the quality of the environment is not constant across different levels of income and education. This implies that the WTP estimation exercise should be designed to capture the heterogeneity in the willingness to pay across different groups of the population. Second, the results suggest that the willingness to pay for a unit of improvement in the quality of the environment is not constant across different levels of income and education. This implies that the WTP estimation exercise should be designed to capture the heterogeneity in the willingness to pay across different groups of the population.

$\langle \eta, M \otimes S \otimes \dots \otimes U \rangle = \langle \eta, M \rangle \otimes \langle \eta, S \rangle \otimes \dots \otimes \langle \eta, U \rangle$
 and a set of n elements $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ is a \mathcal{U} -basis for M if and only if
 the corresponding elements $\{\langle \eta, x_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle \eta, x_n \rangle\}$ form a \mathcal{U} -basis for
 $\langle \eta, M \rangle$.

A. The President, the Vice President, & the Speaker of the House.

Q. Timpone . . . 32

Q. Mr. Sullivan, I understand, is not the
best lawyer in New York City, is he not?

There is a growing consensus that the primary cause of the decline in the number of children in the United States is the declining birth rate. The declining birth rate is the result of a number of factors, including the increasing age of women at the time of childbirth, the increasing cost of child-rearing, and the increasing desire for a smaller family.

Coxsack Military Presence in Cuba

19. The author notes that the first aspect of the study is the fact that the study is the first of its kind to be conducted in the United States.

For a full and complete list of President Kennedy's

U.S. Postpones Underground Nuclear Tests in Nevada

Statement by President Kennedy

During the present discussions in Washington and New York on the nuclear test ban treaty joining the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States, I have asked the Atomic Energy Commission to postpone underground tests in Nevada. We are maintaining the capability and readiness to resume our test program at any time. We have no intention of continuing an indefinite moratorium. Testing will resume if it is clear we cannot achieve a workable agreement we will not consider unfair.

¹Read to news correspondents, July 26, 1963, in *Life* Magazine, White House Press Room release.

For background, see *Documents of 1963*, 1963, p. 198.

... stating the matter in a rather subtle, but nevertheless critical way in connection with the H-bomb test point. I wonder if you could tell us what your own estimate of the situation is?

A. The information that we have on that has been made public. I believe the Department of Defense issued a statement yesterday on certain aspects of it. There is a significant Soviet thrust, my presence in Cuba will be of great concern to the United States, but I do not believe that there has been a recent significant buildup of any nuclear programs. I think the Department of Defense states the concerns of the particular point, it also states the sense of Soviet military personnel that there is something which the United States should be concerned about.

Situation in Viet-Nam

The Moscow statement is not a part of the H-bomb test negotiations. Does it indicate that the U.S. effort to help the Vietnamese is not being given the same priority as the H-bomb test? Mr. Wilamowski says that the U.S. is going to get it.

A. I think it is a statement such as we make in Viet-Nam at any one time there are going to be both plus and minus in the situation. There is no major official disagreement, and frustrating type of operation, than those that

are required to deal with guerrilla action supported from outside of a country, such as we have in that country. You may have seen some comments the Admiral Harry D. Felt made on a recent trip there.

There are some definite, encouraging elements. There are of course, as between Government and Mr. Ho Chi Minh, the ratio of arms supplied is just between the two sides, the steady expansion of the strategic hamlet program, the increasingly effective work of the military police along the border areas—all these are some turning of the situation.

It is also a surprise finally that we have not been able to find the opportunity given to us by the U.S. in Viet-Nam for full and candid exchange of information, and we are discussing it more and more time to time and most important with the Government of Viet-Nam. We are fully understand the difficulties faced by our government in this area and would like to work as best as we can with as possible, but under these conditions it is not easy to get a clear picture of the situation.

We believe that there could be some further exchange of information in the situation in Viet-Nam. It is a good idea of information about it. The Viet-Nam representatives of the press.

Soviet Position on Nuclear Testing

Mr. Wilamowski says that the Soviet Union is not going to accept the H-bomb test ban treaty. Does it indicate that the Soviet Union is not going to accept the H-bomb test ban treaty? Mr. Wilamowski says that the Soviet Union is not going to accept the H-bomb test ban treaty.

A. Well, we are frankly I think in a position to say that we are not going to accept the H-bomb test ban treaty. It is not something that we are doing on the other side which would be a technical and difficult problem in a situation.

I would like to think that one of the problems of the H-bomb test ban treaty is that I just don't think it is a question of what each side is doing, it is a question of the different of our two positions, the Soviet may have a point of the inspection is unnecessary to

order of the free world supports the free-trade principle. I think it is wrong there was something less than 100 per cent, or a good many of those countries, a genuine charter from free-world flag countries to bloc enterprises. So there existed a attitude which the attitude of the heads of the free world toward Cuba has been having a very practical effect.

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you have any reflection from the situation in Europe or elsewhere to which the United States is being called to take action, or do you think the situation is still in the hands of the United Nations?

A. No. We ourselves do not have, and do not see any early prospect of having, restrictions on Cuba, which would clearly distinguish her from the Soviet Union and other countries. And that is a very unfortunate situation.

Mr. Secretary, I think that we have seen a lot of things during the last year, and that we might, in fact, be a little more confident and get some improvement in our ability to distinguish between our enemies and our friends, but we don't see in the future. Here, present the technical capability of doing this job without actual on-site inspection.

Again, I repeat that the Soviet Union has such a capability—and a country which put two astronauts within a few miles of each other in outer space may have such capability as far as we know—we have not seen the instruments, and we have not seen any technical demonstration of that capacity.

Q. Mr. Secretary, does the part-lineate thinking include any proposed to all political functions to the existing Western European union?

A. I have heard that suggestion come from across the Atlantic, but I don't believe that has come up for any intergovernmental conversations at this point. I am not aware of it.

Q. Sir, at the point of adjournment from Geneva there was some speculation that there might be more hope returning on peripheral issues, apart from the test ban, such as the communication between Moscow and Washington. Do you have any hope that this may turn out to be the area of advance when you go back to Geneva?

A. That is a very serious question, concentrated on the test ban, but it is not not gotten into a number of other questions. But we would like to see it be possible to take the test ban out of these other and important questions and get it far off on the test ban, and if agreement there would be a good deal of progress. A nuclear test ban agreement would be a matter of real importance.

Q. Mr. Secretary, on the matter of aid to Cuba, do you think the United States will be able to get a better deal than it has with the United Nations in the past?

A. The United Nations, in the terms of day, is a very good thing, in as much as it is a very good thing to have today, but it is not a very good thing to have in the past.

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you think that the United States is going to be able to get a better deal than it has with the United Nations in the past?

A. No, I don't think so, but I think that the United States is going to be able to get a better deal than it has with the United Nations in the past.

Nuclear Testing by Other Countries

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you think the question of French nuclear testing is a question of the United Nations or a question of the United States?

A. I think that in all of these discussions over the years on this matter the Soviets on their side said that they would hope and expect that France would sign an agreement, and we ourselves have expressed our own concern that any other country, such as China, might initiate nuclear testing, so that this has been a subject that has been a part of the discussions from the beginning.

Q. Mr. Secretary, there are those in the past who have sought to put the problem that the French are following in Europe as far